

FISCAL NOTE

Bill #: SB0174

Title: Sulfur dioxide emission control plans

**Primary
Sponsor:** John Bohlinger

Status: As introduced

Sponsor signature	Date	Dave Lewis, Budget Director	Date
-------------------	------	-----------------------------	------

Fiscal Summary

	<u>FY2000 Difference</u>	<u>FY2001 Difference</u>
FTE	2.00	2.00
Expenditures:		
State Special Revenue (02)	106,900	106,900
Revenue:		
State Special Revenue (02)	106,900	106,900
Total		
Net Impact on General Fund Balance:	0	0

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
	X	Significant Local Gov. Impact		X	Technical Concerns
	X	Included in the Executive Budget		X	Significant Long-Term Impacts

Fiscal Analysis

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. Implementation will require use of computer modeling to establish the emission limitations which will be necessary (as predicted by the model) to protect the Montana ambient air quality standards for sulfur dioxide (SO₂).
2. Billings/Laurel, East Helena, Great Falls, and Colstrip have multiple sources of SO₂ and will require the development of emission control plans.

(continued)

3. The emissions control plans for Billings/Laurel, East Helena, and Great Falls will require substantial reductions in allowable emissions and minor to moderate reductions in actual emissions.
4. The emission control plan for Colstrip may require reductions in allowable emissions but will likely not require reductions in actual emissions.
5. No additional ambient monitors will be required.
6. DEQ will be able to negotiate an emission control plan with each of the affected sources – no contested case hearings before the Board of Environmental Review will be required.
7. The development of emission control plans for Billings/Laurel, East Helena, Great Falls and possibly Colstrip will require two (2) additional FTEs over a two (2) year period. A grade 16 air quality specialist to negotiate and write the emission control plans and a grade 15 modeler to conduct and review computer modeling to establish the emission limitations.
8. The state has the ability to collect sufficient air quality operating fees to offset the expenditures. Given the passage of CI-75, the Board of Environmental Review may no longer has the authority to set air quality fees. If voters do not approve the fees some other funding source will be required to fund expenditures. A companion bill referring fees to the voters may be required.

FISCAL IMPACT:

	FY2000 <u>Difference</u>	FY2001 <u>Difference</u>
FTE	2.00	2.00
<u>Expenditures:</u>		
Personal Services	71,300	71,300
Operating Expenses	<u>35,600</u>	<u>35,600</u>
TOTAL	106,900	106,900
<u>Funding:</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	106,900	106,900
<u>Revenues:</u>		
Air Quality Operating Fees (02)	106,900	106,900

LONG-RANGE IMPACTS:

The additional two (2.00) FTE are necessary until the emission control plans are negotiated. If assumption number 6 does not materialize additional and substantial costs will be incurred.